



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,553	09/26/2005	Mamoru Takimura	Q90237	1936
23373	7590	01/09/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			FISCHER, JUSTIN R	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/550,553	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAKIMURA, MAMORU
	<b>Examiner</b> Justin R. Fischer	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2008.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 2,4,6 and 7 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DS/06)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lommerts (US 5,194,210, of record) and further in view of Yamada (US 4,987,939, newly cited), Ueyoko (US 5,205,882, newly cited), and Ogino (US 4,628,977, newly cited).

Lommerts broadly teaches a tire construction including a rubberized fiber material comprising polyketone fibers (Column 1, Lines 5-10 and Column 5, Lines 30-40). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized such a disclosure as being directed to each of the fundamental tire components, including the carcass and the belt. In this instance, however, the reference is completely silent with respect to the 100% modulus of the topping or coating rubber in said rubberized fiber material. In any event, topping/coating rubbers consisting of natural rubber and having the claimed modulus values are consistent with the conventional and extensively used topping/coating rubber compositions, as shown for example by Yamada (Column 2, Lines 43+ and Column 4, Lines 60+), Ueyoko (Column 4, Lines 10-30), and Ogino (Column 4, Lines 5-20). Independent of the tire component and the cord material, the preponderance of evidence suggests that the claimed

modulus values are consistent with those commonly used in the tire industry in order to achieve a balance between mechanical properties and heat generation. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to form the topping/coating rubber of Lommerts with a composition satisfying the claimed modulus.

As to claim 4, the polyketone described by Lommerts is an alternating polymer of carbon monoxide and ethylene (Column 2, Lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 6, as noted above, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized Lommerts as being broadly directed to each of the fundamental tire components, including the carcass and the belt. Furthermore, Yamada, Ueyoko, and Ogino recognize the known use of such topping/coating rubbers in a wide variety of tire components, including the carcass and the belt.

With respect to claim 7, a fair reading of Lommerts suggests the general use of polyketone fibers in tire reinforcing components. More particularly, the benefits of high strength and improved creep resistance would be highly desirable in all tire constructions, including passenger car tires.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 1 and 5 are allowed.
4. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Justin R. Fischer** whose telephone number is (571) 272-1215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Justin Fischer  
/Justin R Fischer/

Application/Control Number: 10/550,553

Page 5

Art Unit: 1791

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791

January 6, 2009